

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-13 and 15 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 12 and 13 are independent.

Claim 12 and 13 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 12, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed toward non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it is noted that claim 15 is dependent on claim 1 and it is not possible for a claim to be directed toward non-statutory subject matter unless the independent claim from which it depends is also alleged to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is directed to statutory subject matter by depending from claim 1.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 12 and 13 to recite that the business center has a central processor. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are directed toward statutory subject matter. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Gramann in view of Yu. Claims 1-4, 8, 10, 11 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramann in view of Sokel and Yu. Further, claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gramann in view of Sokel, Yu and Stanfield, claim 9 stands rejected as obvious over Gramann in view of Sokel, Yu and Sprenger and claim 12 stands rejected as obvious over Gramann in view of Yu and Sprenger. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

The rejections are the same rejections made in the Office Action of May 11, 2009 except that the Examiner now relies upon newly cited Yu in each rejection for disclosing a first processing means authenticated by a second processing means to enable the first processing means to make booking of at least one product from at least one agent or customer. Specifically, the Examiner states that Yu discloses a system for accessing inventory including a first processing means authenticated by a second processing means to enable the first processing means to make a purchase of at least one product, citing column 2, lines 51-63 and column 3, line 62 – column 4, line 6. The Examiner then concluded that it would have been obvious to use this feature with the system of Gramann for the predictable result of securely accessing inventory information. All rejections incorporate the combination of Gramann and Yu.

The claimed system operates in a mode which is agnostic to the type of data that is synchronized (it does not use query tables) and can operate on many types of business data that needs to be synchronized between nodes which creates a key differentiator in relation to the amount and type of data that is synchronized. All data changes on either the primary or secondary systems are recorded which allows replication of an entire business between computers and not a sub-set of the data. This synchronization process also enables third parties (e.g. support personnel) to access the full set of business data from the central location. It may also be used by third party distribution channels (e.g. online and offline travel agencies) to access the data they need to fulfill their distribution obligations. Additionally, the claimed invention is designed to synchronize data between a primary computer and multiple computers within the same business.

Gramann discloses a process of synchronizing calendar based data between a primary and a secondary computer and utilizes query tables to manage this process. There is a significant difference between the manner in which synchronization is managed in this citation in Gramann and the claimed invention.

Yu discloses a method of pushing or pulling catalogue information across multiple points of sale. It is primarily useful for keeping local copies of the catalogue up to date. It does not attempt to deal with any of the issues in the travel industry of limited availability or pushing

bookings and reservation data from multiple points of sale into the relevant systems. It is a system of keeping relatively static information up to date at each interested point of sale. The Examiner refers to column 2, lines 51-63 and column 3, line 62 to column 4, line 6. Column 2, lines 51-63 simply state that a catalog server 8 may subscribe to remote systems 6 so that changes to each system 6 is reflected in the catalog server 8. Column 3, line 62 to column 4, line 6 describes the flow chart of Figure 3 depicting the subscription process. While there is an authentication process, this process allows the catalog server 8 to access data stored in the remote servers 6. In this way, changes to the remote servers 6 is reflected in the catalog server 8 is unrelated to enabling the first processing to make a purchase of at least one product.

The teachings of Yu are not applicable to Gramann as the two disclosures use mutually exclusive approaches to data management that cannot be reconciled into a single system. As all rejection rely upon the combination of Yu with Gramann, Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1, 12 and 13 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Gramann and Yu, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 2-11 and 15, Applicants submit that these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-11 and 15 are allowable. In addition, these claims recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art references. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.


In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Christopher J. McDonald, Registration No. 41,533, at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: May 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James M. Slattery
Registration No.: 28380
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000